

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/663,212	09/15/2003	Jack A. Dant	6683.70USU1	2345
WOOD, HERRON & EVANS (ZIMMER SPINE) 2700 CAREW TOWER			EXAMINER	
			SWIGER III, JAMES L	
441 VINE STREET CINCINNATI, OH 45202		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
= = ·····			3733	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
	•		06/15/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/663,212 ·	DANT, JACK A.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
·	James L. Swiger	3733			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE of the state of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period we failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	l. ely filed the mailing date of this communication. O (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status	•	·			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 Ap	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>05 April 2007</u> .				
2a)⊠ This action is FINAL . 2b)☐ This					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the					
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	3 O.G. 213.			
Disposition of Claims					
 4) Claim(s) 1-4, 6-11, 14-16, 18-22, and 28-29 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-4, 6-11, 14-16, 18-22, and 28-29 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. 					
Application Papers					
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner 10) ☑ The drawing(s) filed on 9/15/2003 is/are: a) ☑ a Applicant may not request that any objection to the d Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner	accepted or b) objected to by the drawing (s) be held in abeyance. See on is required if the drawing (s) is objected to be a considered if the drawing (s) is objected to be a considered if the drawing (s) is objected to be a considered to be	37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priori application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	have been received. have been received in Application ty documents have been received (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No d in this National Stage			
		•			
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	A) Thinnian Comment	DTO 412\			
2) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary (Paper No(s)/Mail Dat 5) Notice of Informal Pa 6) Other:	e			
S. Patent and Trademark Office	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				

Art Unit: 3733

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 3-6, 9, 11, 18-19, 21-22, and 28-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Burgin (US 4,156,424). Burgin discloses a device for distraction, capable of distracting vertebrae due to its various sizes (see Col. 6, lines 35-42), comprising a base (18 and 24) and a first and second paddle coupled to the base (64), and wherein the paddles may be moved from a first to a second orientation. The device of Burgin further discloses a pivot hinge (58) that connects both the first and second paddles to the base portion, and at opposing ends, and wherein the paddles have rounded ends (see near 64 in Fig. 1), and wherein either of the paddles could be capable of being a lordotic paddle, as it appears to have a curved profile in Fig. 1 to address the Lordotic curveature. Burgin further disclose a bridge portion that extends between the base portion (26) wherein the paddles are capable of moving relative to the bridge portion in an open and closed position, and wherein the paddles are adapted for insertion between adjacent vertebrae prior to distraction in a closed position. Further the paddles connected to the base portion may be pivoted to a position wherein the paddles are approximately parallel to the base and to another position where they may be

Art Unit: 3733

perpendicular to the base (see Fig. 1, they may be rotated as such relative to the base). The parallel position can be considered a closed position and the perpendicular can be considered an open position and the body is capable of distracting. Also, depending on how one views the device the paddles can be considered either less or more upright. Additionally at least the curved portion of the paddle portion may be considered at least a major face that faces the bridge in the closed position and towards each other in the open position.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Burgin '424 in view of Brantigan (US 5,425,772). Burgin discloses the claimed invention except for the paddles being radiolucent. Brantigan disclose an implantable device for the spine that may be made of a radiolucent material (Col. 1, lines 23-24). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to construct the device of Burgin having at least a paddle portion made of a radiolucent material in view of Brantigan to better guide the device in use in the spine.

Claims 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

Art Unit: 3733

over Burgin '424 in view of Baynham et al. (US 6,224,599). Burgin discloses the claimed invention except for the paddles and bridge member defining a portal window when they are in an open position that define a sight line. Baynham et al. disclose a wedge portion that can create a 'window' for use in accessing the spinal area for distraction (see Fig. 5, and Col. 2 lines 15-35). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to construct the device of Burgin having at least a wedge distractor window area in view of Baynham et al. to better access the spinal area in use of the device.

Claims 2, 16, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Burgin '424. With regard to claims 2 and 16, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to construct the first and second paddles having a height in the range of 4 to 18 mm, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. In re Aller, 105 USPQ 233.

Claims 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Burgin '424. Burgin discloses the claimed invention except for the first paddle having surface irregularities and serrations. It would have been an obvious matter of design choice to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to construct paddle having surface irregularities and serrations, since applicant has not disclosed that such solve any stated problem or is anything more than one of numerous shapes or configurations a person ordinary skill in the art would find obvious for the purpose of

Art Unit: 3733

providing paddle with said surface modifications. In re Dailey and Eilers, 149 USPQ 47 (1966).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 4/5/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The amended claims are still considered to read on the prior art of record because the claims require only that the first and second paddles *may be* pivoted. In alternative language, claims 11, 18, 21, 28, and 29 also claim a similar limitation (being movable; pivotally moveable) where in the two paddles are capable of NOT being moved at all. In that case, more specific "generally horizontal and generally vertical" orientations would be irrelevant, as the paddles have not moved from their origin.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 3733

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James L. Swiger whose telephone number is 571-272-5557. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 9:00am to 5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eduardo Robert can be reached on 571-272-4719. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JLS

SUPERVISOR SUPERVISOR